

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of October 7, 2005. Upon entry of this amendment, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above referenced application. Claims 7-23 remain in the application. Claims 1-6 have been canceled. Claims 7, 13 and 19 have been amended to clarify the language used. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, claims and/or figures. In this regard, no new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sibecas et. al US 2004/0203342 (*Sibecas*). In response, Applicant has amended claim 13 to clarify the language used and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Sibecas teaches a communication device used as a terminal that is capable of functioning as a router for communication between other portable devices in the system (*see* Abstract).

In contradistinction, claim 13, for example, as amended to clarify the language used includes:

to function as a client to a first *wireless network access point* and to function as a second *wireless network access point* to one or more other client(s)

Applicant respectfully asserts that a router (or repeater) is not a wireless network access point. A repeater merely repeats signals received so as to extend the range of the original signal. A wireless network access point, on the other hand, performs functions such as beacon, client connection table maintenance, client authentication, dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) service, etc.

As such, *Sibecas* does not disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 13, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102(e) rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn. Based at least on their dependency to patentable base claim 13, Applicant respectfully requests that the 102(e) rejection of claims 14 and 15 also be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sibecas*, and further in view of Suganthan et al. US 6,791,506 (*Suganthan*). In response, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 19 to clarify the language used and respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant notes that claims 7 and 19 include elements similar to claim 13 and the arguments presented previously with respect to claim 13 apply to claims 7 and 19 as well. Applicant notes that *Suganthan* is not cited as curing and does not in fact cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to *Sibecas*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 19 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 8-12, 16-18, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sibecas* in combination with other references. Applicant notes that these other references are not cited as curing and do not in fact cure the deficiencies of *Sibecas* as applied to base claims 7, 13 and 19. Therefore, dependent claims 8-12, 16-18, and 20-23 would be patentable at least because of their dependency to patentable base claims 7, 13, and 19 (respectively). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 103(a) rejections of claims 8-12, 16-18, and 20-23 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-23 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
Satyendra Yadav

Date: 2/7/06 by: /David L. Guglielmi Reg. No. 55,229/
David L. Guglielmi
Reg. No. 55,229
Agent for Applicant

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200